



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

MC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,662	06/15/2001	Kenji Tsukada	Q64982	6948

7590 06/13/2002

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

VO, ANH T N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2861

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

[Handwritten mark]

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/881,662

Applicant(s)
TSUKADA ET AL.

Examiner
ANH VO

Art Unit
2861



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed on 04/03/2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2861

NON-FINAL REJECTION

Response to Applicant's Amendment

The rejection over Haykama et al is withdrawn in view of the arguments presented in the amendments

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Appropriate correction or clarification is required.

In claim 13, it is still unclear what the "lyophobic part" is and how it is read on the preferred embodiment on the preferred embodiment or can be determined on the drawings. The same is true for claim 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2861

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hara et al (US Pat. 6,312,115) in view of Hasegawa et al. (JP Pat. 62095225).

Note: The method steps are inherently taught in the apparatus device/limitations in the rejections as follow:

Hara et al disclose in Figure 17-18E and 19 an ink cartridge comprising:

- a container body (1);
- a pressure reducing container (43) and a vacuum pump (45);
- charged ink (67);
- wherein a pressure in the ink body (1) is reduced to a pressure lower than an atmosphere pressure by the vacuum pump (45) and the container (1) is charged with the charged ink (67).

However, Hara et al. do not disclose the piezoelectric device for detecting a consumption condition of the liquid.

Nevertheless, Hasegawa et al. teach in Figures 1-5 an ink tank comprising a piezoelectric device (4,5) attached to the ink tank for detecting the remaining amount of ink or the ink consumption condition in order to alarm the operator.

It would have been obvious to a person having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the piezoelectric device taught by Hasegama in the ink container of Hara et al for the purpose of detecting the remaining ink in order to alarm the operator. It is noted that selecting the steps of assembling and refilling the ink container to reduce cost would be

Art Unit: 2861

obvious to a person having skill in the art depending upon a particular environment or an application in which the modified ink container of Hara et al is to be used.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

The applicant argues that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the Hayakawa et al. reference with the Hara et al reference. The argument is not persuasive because the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Hara et al disclose an ink cartridge but does not disclose a piezoelectric device for detecting the consumption condition of ink which is suggested in the Hara et al. Therefore, employ the piezoelectric device in the ink cartridge of Hayakawa et al for the purpose of detecting the ink consumption would have been obvious to a person having skill in the art.

Also, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

CONCLUSION

Art Unit: 2861

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Anh Vo whose telephone number is (703) 305-8194. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. The fax number of this Group 2800 is (703) 305-3431 or 305-3432.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



ANH T. N. VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

June 11, 2002